REMARKS

In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, Claims 9 and 10 have been amended.
Claim 11 has been amended to correct a grammatical error.
Claims 1-32 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

In the Office Action, at page 2, Claims 9 and 10 were corrected as suggested by the Examiner to more precisely state the invention.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-13 AND 15-31 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY LOU ET AL. (LOU, 2003/00935990)

The Examiner has stated that claims 1-13 and 15-31, as broadly drafted do not define any structure/step that differs from Lou.

Applicant submits that claims 1-13 and 15-31 are not discussed by Lou. Lou discusses a signal switch for sharing a video monitor, a plurality of console devices and one or more peripheral devices in any of a plurality of computer systems; whereas, applicant claims in claim 1 and 6 a method and apparatus in which a plurality of universal serial bus (USB) systems share one display device and where information is buffered when transmitting that information to a second (shared) USB system. This differs from Lou where buffering data transfer is not discussed. Lou emphasizes emulation of a computer and asynchronous or synchronous switching of USB peripherals to avoid interruption of data, rather than Applicant's invention where buffering of data is taught to preclude loss of data during switching. Applicants's invention is not discussed by Lou. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejections to the claims 1-13 and 15-31 be withdrawn. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Regarding claim 6, Applicant traverses the rejection of this claim and submits that Lou discusses a hub switch module device that emulates origination from a computer, whereas Applicant teaches a relay unit that transmits buffered information. Therefore, claim 6 is submitted to be allowable.

With regard to claim 7, Applicant submits that for the same reasons stated above with regard to claim 6, claim 7 is allowable as depending from claim 6 and the rejection of claim 7 is traversed.

Claim 8 is submitted to be allowable as depending from claim 6 which was argued above.

The rejection of claim 9 is traversed. Lou discusses storing a management program in a CPU whereas Applicant utilizes a sharing program stored in a USB host. Lou does not discuss the ID's of USB devices nor does Lou utilize disablement of drivers of USB devices corresponding to selected USB devices as Applicant does. Claim 9 is therefore submitted to be allowable.

Claims 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, and 17 are submitted to be allowable being dependent upon claim 9, as argued above.

In regard to claims 18-28, and 31; Applicant submits that the Examiner's argument that each part of Applicant's invention "is clear" is traversed because only after reading applicant's invention does it become clear, because Lou does not discuss or show Applicant's invention. Lou utilizes USB emulation programs to emulate Human Interface Devices enabling a switch to communicate with the USB ports of PC's where the use of emulation enables a switch to communicate with USB devices or USB PC's at the same time. Applicant teaches a display apparatus with a USB system having a first down port, a second down port and a shared USB device displaying output from the first and second USB systems, wherein a USB hub with a relay unit including a buffer relaying data transmission when the device is shared which is not discussed by Lou. Claims18-28, and 31 are therefore submitted to be allowable.

Claims 29 and 30 depending upon claim 18 are submitted to be allowable.

CLAIM REJECTIONS- 35 USC Sec. 103

With regard to the rejection of claim 14 over Lou, Applicant traverses the rejection. Specifically, Lou does not disclose the use of a buffer for storing transmitted information. The discussion of "buffer" does not appear in Lou. Lou does discuss a peripheral sharing switch that allows all the computers connected to the switch to share USB devices without interruption of data flow when the switch is changed, either synchronously or asynchronously. It should be noted that in Lou where a KVM switch that is also a peripheral sharing switch, allowing all computers connected to the switch to share any USB device, which can switch the KVM channels and peripheral channels to a common computer either asynchronously or synchronously without interruption of data flow when the switching takes place actually teaches against the use of buffering, since buffering is not needed in this scenario of circuit switching which allows for data to be transferred with guaranteed transmission of all data; this is so because the circuits are reserved all the way from sender to receiver before the start of transfer. Therefore, Claim 14 is submitted to be allowable.

For the same reasons as stated above, and the fact that Lou does not discuss data ID, claim 32 is submitted to be allowable over Lou.

All pending claims are submitted to be allowable.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: <u>October 13, 2005</u>

By: _____

Gene M. Garner, II
Registration No. 34,172

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501